

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing the application.

The limitations of claim 3 have been added to claim 1 by amendment. Claim 3 has therefore been canceled without prejudice.

The limitations of claims 8 and 9 have been added to claim 7 by amendment. Claims 8 and 9 have therefore been canceled without prejudice.

Claim 33 has been canceled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute claim 33 in the future.

Allowability of Claims 1-38

As presently claimed, Applicants' invention involves an asset having its own unique Universal Resource Locator (URL). Applicants' invention may be used, for example, to obtain information about an asset. For example, a home electronics retailer may obtain information about a television returned for repair by utilizing a URL that is uniquely associated with the particular television. The URL may be used to access a web page that presents information about the particular television returned for repair (e.g., warranty provisions, lot numbers of components within the television, test data regarding the particular television or components in the particular television, etc.).¹ Thus, each of claims 1-38 require an asset to have a "unique Universal Resource Locator (URL)."

Claims 1-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious in light of Collins and Fasset. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action acknowledges that Collins does not teach an asset having a unique Universal Resource Locator. However, the Office Action states that this missing element is taught by Fasset. Applicants respectfully insist that Fasset does not teach an asset having a "unique Universal Resource Locator," as required by each of claims 1-38.

Fasset teaches a "standardized product labeling system" that is useful in identifying similar parts from different vendors. See col. 1, lines 48-52. The labeling

is accomplished via a "key code." A user may access a special web site (identified by reference numeral 130 in FIG. 1), and enter a key code corresponding to a particular product. In response, the user is returned a selection of information for the key code. Included in the selection of information may be a link to a URL for a vendor of the product. See col. 8, lines 61-65. This is far different from an asset having a "unique" URL. Per the system of Fasset, if two Sony televisions were returned to a retailer, the retailer could access the special web site (reference numeral 130 in FIG. 1) for information relating to Sony televisions generally. The special website could perhaps contain a link to Sony's website. However, the special website would present the same URL for both Sony televisions—a URL linking to Sony's web site. See col. 8, lines 61-65 ("Controller 200 then offers user 110 at step 940 the option 970 to look at other key codes or categories 950, or to link to the vendor's URL 1000 for ordering, downloading or obtaining additional information."). Claims 1-38 refer to a "unique" URL, a URL that is different for each asset. Thus, with respect to the hypothetical Sony televisions, the claims require a first URL for the first Sony television and a second URL for the second Sony television. This is neither taught nor suggested by Fasset.

To make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), there must exist some motivation, either generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art or expressly stated in the prior art, to modify the known prior art to arrive at the claimed invention. No motivation has been stated to modify Collins or Fasset to include a unique URL for an asset. Further, no such motivation is articulated within either of those patents themselves. Thus, Collins and Fasset are unable to support a rejection, either alone or in concert, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). For the foregoing reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

¹ The preceding passage is exemplary only. It is intended to generally orient the Examiner to Applicants' invention. Of course, the invention is defined by the claims.

Allowability of claims 39 and 40

Claims 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious in light of Collins and Fasset. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 39 and 40 require a "webpage uniquely associated with [an] asset." Applicants point out that for the same reasons that Collins and Fasset fail to teach a URL uniquely associated with an asset, those references also fail to teach or suggest a "webpage uniquely associated with [an] asset." Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).


Conclusion

Claims 1-40 remain pending in the application. These claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above. This amendment is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request prompt reconsideration, allowance, and passage of the application to issue. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number below to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 371-5207

Date: 1 Oct. 2003



Nicholas P. Johns
Reg. No. 48,995
NPJ:PSTklg

23552

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE